



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 11, 2003

Mr. Robert R. Ray
Assistant City Attorney
City of Longview
P. O. Box 1952
Longview, Texas 75606-1952

OR2003-8907

Dear Mr. Ray:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 192573.

The City of Longview (the "city") received a request for information related to a named city police officer. You state that most of the information has been provided to the requestor. You claim that portions of the remaining requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," including information that is encompassed by the common-law right to privacy. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Information is protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy if (1) it contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) it is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See id.* at 685

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.--El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court applied the common-law right to privacy addressed in *Industrial Foundation* to an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files at issue in *Ellen* contained third-party witness statements, an affidavit in which the individual accused of the

misconduct responded to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court upheld the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the disclosure of such documents sufficiently served the public's interest in the matter. *Id.* The court further held, however, that "the public does not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.* Therefore, when there is an adequate summary of an investigation, the summary and any statements of the person under investigation must be released, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of witnesses and victims must still be redacted from the statements.

In accordance with *Ellen*, this office typically has required the release of a document analogous to the conclusions of the board of inquiry in *Ellen*, but has held that a governmental body must withhold both the identities of victims and witnesses of alleged sexual harassment and any information that would tend to identify such a victim or witness. In this instance, we find that the submitted "Internal Investigation Report" constitutes an adequate summary of the city's investigation of the alleged sexual harassment. We also find that an affidavit of the individual under investigation for sexual harassment, which we have marked, constitutes a "statement of the accused." We therefore conclude that the city must release the Internal Investigation Report and the statement of the accused, but only after redacting the identifying information we have marked as coming within the common-law right of privacy. The remaining information related to the investigation must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, you argue that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, and social security number of a peace officer, as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 or 552.1175 in electing for the confidentiality of such information. Thus, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.117.

Finally, section 552.130 of the Government Code prohibits the release of information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, we conclude: (1) the city must release the Internal Investigation Report and the statement of the accused, but only after redacting the identifying information we have marked as coming within the common-law right of privacy; the remaining information related to the investigation must be withheld; (2) the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.117; and (3) the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.130. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or

complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sarah Swanson".

Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 192573

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John Lynch
c/o Robert R. Ray
City of Longview
P. O. Box 1952
Longview, Texas 75606-1952
(w/o enclosures)